## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIO	ONAL SEARCH	IING AUTHOR	ITY					
To:					PCT			
	Y. L. MELNICH ICH (1995) LT							
	HEM BEGIN S			W/D	ITTEN OPINION OF THE			
RAMAT GA	an, israel s	52 521		INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY				
					(PCT Rule 43bis.1)			
				Date of mailing	4 0 005 0000			
				(day/month/year) FOR FURTHER	100CT 2006			
Applicant's	Applicant's or agent's file reference				See paragraph 2 below			
31144	1 11 3.5	Т.,	nternational filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)			
Internationa	l application No							
PCT/IL06/0	)0059		5 January 2006 (15.01 both national classifica		13 January 2005 (13.01.2005)			
			John Marionan Gradomica					
	<b>01T 1/166</b> ( 200: 50/370.08,363.0							
Applicant								
SPECTRUM	M DYNAMICS	LLC		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
				<u> </u>				
1. This op	oinion contains is	ndications relation	ng to the following iter	ns:				
$\square$	Box No. I	Basis of the op	ainion					
		•	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
	Box No. II	Priority						
	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability							
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention								
	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial							
	DON'T TO T		citations and explanation					
	Box No. VI	Certain docum	ents cited					
	Box No. VII	Certain defects	s in the international a	pplication				
	Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the internation	онаг аррисанов				
2. FURT	HER ACTIO	N						
If a de	mand for intern	ational prelimina	ary examination is ma	de, this opinion will	be considered to be a written opinion of the			
Interna	tional Prelimina	ary Examining.	Authority ("IPEA") e	except that this does IPEA has notified th	not apply where the applicant chooses an le International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b)			
Author that wr	itten opinions o	f this Internation	al Searching Authority	will not be so consi	dered.			
If this	opinion is, as p	rovided above, o	considered to be a wri	tten opinion of the I	PEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the			
IPEA :	a written reply	togetner, where ISA/220 or befo	e appropriate, with an re the expiration of 22	months from the pri	he expiration of 3 months from the date of lority date, whichever expires later.			
		e Form PCT/IS/		•				
101101	. m.o. optiono, so							
3. For fur	rther details, see	notes to Form	PCT/ISA/220.					
				etion of this	Authorized officer, (1 6)			
	mailing address Iail Stop PCT, Att	of the ISA/US n: ISA/US	opinion	outon or mile	David Porta			
C	ommissioner for I			A007 /04 00 0000	David Polita//			
	.O. Box 1450 Jexandria, Virgini	a 22313-1450	01 September	2006 (01.09.2006)	Telephone No. 571-272-2444			

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2005)

From the

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.	
PCT/IL06/00059	

Box No. I Basis of this opinion	_						
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
the international application in the language in which it was filed							
a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).							
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
a. type of material							
a sequence listing							
table(s) related to the sequence listing							
b. format of material	:						
on paper							
in electronic form	i						
c. time of filing/furnishing							
contained in the international application as filed.							
filed together with the international application in electronic form.							
furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.							
In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.							
4. Additional comments:							
	_						

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/IL06/00059

Novelty (N)  Claims  Claims  Claims  Inventive step (IS)  Claims  Claims  NONE  Claims  Claims  Claims  NONE  Claims	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement							
Inventive step (IS)  Claims 1-17  Claims 1-17  Industrial applicability (IA)  Claims 1-17  Claims NONE  Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,94:  Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstructive Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject man								
Inventive step (IS)  Claims 1-17  Claims 1-17  Industrial applicability (IA)  Claims 1-17  Claims 1-17  Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,94:  Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstructive the Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject man	YES							
Claims 1-17  Industrial applicability (IA)  Claims 1-17  Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942 Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstructed the Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material applicability and the subject material applicability because the subject material applicability applicability because the subject material applicability applicability applicability applicability applicability applicability applicability	NO							
Claims 1-17  Industrial applicability (IA)  Claims 1-17  Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942 Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstruction based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material applicability because the subject material set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material set out in PCT Article 33(4).	YES							
Industrial applicability (IA)  Claims 1-17  Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942)  Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstruction the Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material.	NO NO							
Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942 Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstructive the Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material applicability applicabil								
Claims NONE  2. Citations and explanations:  Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942).  Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstructive Compton scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject man	YES							
Claims 1-17 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shwartz et al. (US 2003/0208117 A1 or 6,942 Shwartz discloses a similar SPECT image reconstruction and diagnosis method as claimed, where the image is reconstruction scatter angle and initial and final photon energies, and where the diagnosis and future dose administration based on the SPECT measurement of the radiopharmaceutical in the body and special patient parameters.  Claims 1-17 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject material applicability	NO							
	icted based on is determined							

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Box No. V) (April 2005)

#### NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220 (continued)

The letter must indicate the differences between the claims as filed and the claims as amended. It must, in particular, indicate, in connection with each claim appearing in the international application (it being understood that identical indications concerning several claims may be grouped), whether

- (i) the claim is unchanged;
- (ii) the claim is cancelled;
- (iii) the claim is new;
- (iv) the claim replaces one or more claims as filed;
- the claim is the result of the division of a claim as filed.

#### The following examples illustrate the manner in which amendments must be explained in the accompanying letter:

- 1. [Where originally there were 48 claims and after amendment of some claims there are 51]: "Claims 1 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 to 48 replaced by amended claims bearing the same numbers; claims 30, 33 and 36 unchanged; new claims 49 to 51 added."
- 2. [Where originally there were 15 claims and after amendment of all claims there are 11]: "Claims 1 to 15 replaced by amended claims 1 to 11."
- 3. [Where originally there were 14 claims and the amendments consist in cancelling some claims and in adding new claims]: "Claims 1 to 6 and 14 unchanged; claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added." or

- "Claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added; all other claims unchanged."
- 4. [Where various kinds of amendments are made]: "Claims I-10 unchanged; claims 11 to 13, 18 and 19 cancelled; claims 14, 15 and 16 replaced by amended claim 14; claim 17 subdivided into amended claims 15, 16 and 17; new claims 20 and 21 added."

#### "Statement under Article 19(1)" (Rule 46.4)

The amendments may be accompanied by a statement explaining the amendments and indicating any impact that such amendments might have on the description and the drawings (which cannot be amended under Article 19(1)).

The statement will be published with the international application and the amended claims.

### It must be in the language in which the international application is to be published.

It must be brief, not exceeding 500 words if in English or if translated into English.

It should not be confused with and does not replace the letter indicating the differences between the claims as filed and as amended. It must be filed on a separate sheet and must be identified as such by a heading, preferably by using the words "Statement under Article 19(1)."

It may not contain any disparaging comments on the international search report or the relevance of citations contained in that report. Reference to citations, relevant to a given claim, contained in the international search report may be made only in connection with an amendment of that claim.

### Consequence if a demand for international preliminary examination has already been filed

If, at the time of filing any amendments and any accompanying statement, under Article 19, a demand for international preliminary examination has already been submitted, the applicant must preferably, at the time of filing the amendments (and any statement) with the International Bureau, also file with the International Preliminary Examining Authority a copy of such amendments (and of any statement) and, where required, a translation of such amendments for the procedure before that Authority (see Rules 55.3(a) and 62.2, first sentence). For further information, see the Notes to the demand form (PCT/IPEA/401).

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, the written opinion of the International Searching Authority will, except in certain cases where the International Preliminary Examining Authority did not act as International Searching Authority and where it has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b), be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority. If a demand is made, the applicant may submit to the International Preliminary Examining Authority a reply to the written opinion together, where appropriate, with amendments before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later (Rule 43bis.1(c)).

## Consequence with regard to translation of the international application for entry into the national phase

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that, upon entry into the national phase, a translation of the claims as amended under Article 19 may have to be furnished to the designated/elected Offices, instead of, or in addition to, the translation of the claims as filed.

For further details on the requirements of each designated/elected Office, see the PCT Applicant's Guide, Volume II.